

REMARKS

Drawings

We have amended the drawings as shown on the enclosed replacement sheets. We respectfully request the Examiner's approval of the changes.

Specification

The office action objected to the disclosure on the grounds that Figures 1-2 are labeled "Prior Art." Applicants are unsure of why the drawings were so labeled. The specification does not contain any references to the drawings being prior art. Accordingly, we have amended the drawings to remove the label "prior art." The disclosure is now free of objectionable material.

35 USC 101

The office action rejected the claims for being directed to non-statutory subject matter. The claims, as amended, fully satisfy section 101.

35 USC 112

The office action rejected claims 5-8 and 21 for being indefinite. The claims, as amended, fully satisfy section 112.

35 USC 102

The office action rejected claims 1-7, 9-12, and 17-23 under section 102(e) as being anticipated by Yared (US 2003/0149781 A1). The claims, as amended, are patentably distinguished from Yared. Taking claim 9 as an example, Yared does not show "establishing one or more affiliations of computer-implemented service providers, each affiliation collectively programmed to act as a single entity on a network for purposes of any of authentication, federation, and authorization." Nor does Yared show "establishing a computer-implemented owner of each said affiliation that is programmed to maintain a list that shows which service providers are members of said affiliation, as well as any control structure or meta-data associated with said affiliation."

The office action cited Yared's paragraph 117 in regard to the foregoing

limitations. Yared is said to show various identity providers and service providers and links between them. [Yared: para. 119] Furthermore, Yared is said to use a single sign-on architecture. [Yared: Abstract] However, rather than an affiliation, Yared shows a various identity and service providers as spokes around a hub, namely, the network 130.

More to the point, Yared fails to show the affiliation as specifically set forth in the claims. Yared's user, through single sign-on, presumably has the ability to be authenticated sufficiently to gain access to all authorized, secured resources throughout one or more systems without additional authentication. [Yared: para. 0046] Presumably, though, Yared's user would thereafter encounter all of the various heterogeneous service providers participating in this authentication scheme. But there is nothing in Yared to teach or suggest an affiliation, and more particularly, an affiliation of service providers that acts as a single entity on the network as claimed.

Accordingly, claim 9 is distinguished from Yared. Independent claim 25 is distinguished on similar grounds. And, even without having to consider the individual merits of dependent claims 10-24, these claims are patentable by virtue of their dependence on allowable claim 9.

35 USC 103

The office action rejected claims 8 and 13-16 under section 102(e) as being anticipated by Yared in view of Applicant's specification. These claims, as amended, are patentably distinguished from the cited combination because they depend from claim 9, which is patentable over Yared as discussed above, and Applicant's specification still does not provide the features missing from Yared. This assumes, for the sake of argument, that the cited sections of Applicant's specification are even prior art.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, all pending claims in the application are patentable over the applied art. We kindly request favorable reconsideration and allowance of all claims in the application.

FEES

If any fees are required by this submission, we enclose an appropriate fee submittal sheet. If fees are required yet this sheet is inadvertently missing, or the fees are incorrect in amount, please charge the charge the required fees, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 07-1445.

Respectfully Submitted,



Michael A. Glenn
Reg. No. 30,176

Customer No. 22,862